

REMARKS

This Supplemental Amendment is hereby filed further to the Request for Continued Examination ("RCE") Transmittal previously filed on December 7, 2005 in this application.

Statement of the Substance of the Examiner Interview

Examiner Tan X. Dinh is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during an Examiner Interview held at the USPTO on January 10, 2006.

In the interview, Applicants' undersigned representative explained the novel features of the claims of this application with a particular emphasis on arguments originally submitted in the Amendment filed on November 7, 2005 in this application (which was entered via the Request for Continued Examination filed on December 7, 2005). Applicants respectfully submit that these previously-filed arguments still apply in this application. For example, an explanation was presented to the Examiner of how the applied U.S. Patent No. 6,542,445 to Ijichi et al. (hereinafter "Ijichi") does not teach or suggest any editing of the table of contents (TOC) portion of the recording medium. An explanation was also presented of how Ijichi does not teach or suggest any group management information within the TOC. See, for example, the arguments at paragraphs 1 and 2 of page 10 of the November 7, 2005 Amendment.

The Examiner noted his agreement during the interview that Ijichi does not appear to disclose any editing of its TOC portion. He also noted his agreement that the TOC portion of Ijichi does not appear to include group management information. See Fig. 2B of the instant application which illustrates group management information (GroupA and GroupB) within the TOC.

The Examiner indicated, however, that he would prefer if the claims explicitly described the “TOC” features. In particular, the Examiner noted that he is reading the claims broadly without incorporating “TOC” features in these regards and he recommended that Applicants proceed by explicitly including “TOC” in the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants have opted to further amend each of the independent claims 9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 to describe “wherein the management information is located at a TOC (table of contents) portion of the information storage medium” in accordance with the discussion that took place during the Examiner Interview.

As discussed previously, the Examiner expressed agreement during the interview that important features of the instant application are the concepts of including group management information within the TOC and also editing the TOC. He noted that he believed that these particular features are not disclosed in the applied art of record.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s helpful suggestions during the Examiner Interview.

All Claims are Now in Condition for Allowance

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that newly-amended independent claims 9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance for at least the foregoing reasons.

Newly-Added Claims

In addition, Applicants have added new independent claims 25-29 that mirror the form of previous independent claims 9, 13, 14, 17 and 18, except that the final “wherein” clause of these claims is replaced with “wherein no track number information is repeated among different

groups.” Applicants undersigned representative explained to the Examiner during the January 10, 2006 interview that another important feature of the instant application’s disclosure involves what is described at page 33 as a rule for imparting the track number information (hereinafter “TNO imparting rule.”) As explained at page 33 of the specification, and illustrated, for example, in Fig. 9A, this TNO imparting rule includes a requirement that the same track number information is not used for different groups.

This feature is not met by the applied Ijichi reference. For example, even assuming, *strictly arguendo*, that the playlists PL1 and PL2 shown in Fig. 7 of Ijichi might be interpreted as separate “groups,” as discussed in the instant application, track numbers 1-3 are clearly repeated among these two different “groups.” Thus, the newly-added independent claims, which each include the feature that “wherein no track number information is repeated among different groups” would not be taught or suggested, to any extent, by Ijichi.

Even further, each of these newly-added independent claims include features of moving a track from one group to another, which is also neither shown nor suggested by the applied art of record. As explained in the response previously-filed on November 7, 2005, Ijichi does not include any teaching of moving a track from playlist PL1 to playlist PL2. Instead, these playlists are disclosed as simultaneously existing in Ijichi.

Entry of this Supplemental Amendment is Respectfully Requested

Entry of this Supplemental Amendment is respectfully requested as being compliant with 37 CFR 1.111(a)(2) and MPEP 714.03(a). In particular, 37 CFR 1.111(a)(2) sets forth that the Office may enter a supplemental reply if it is clearly limited to “(B) Adoption of the examiner

suggestion(s)” and “(C) Placement of the application in condition for allowance.” With regard to the amendments to claims 9, 13, 14, 17 and 18, entry is respectfully requested in light of the suggestions of the Examiner in the interview held on January 10, 2006. With regard to newly-presented claims 25-29, entry is respectfully requested in light of the arguments presented above which explain why these claims are clearly in condition for allowance over the applied art of record.

As explained in MPEP 714.03(a), “[w]hen a supplemental reply is filed in sufficient time to be entered into the application before the examiner considers the prior reply, the examiner may approve the entry of the supplemental reply ... The examiner has the discretion to approve entry of a supplemental reply that is not listed above.”

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner indicated that he will need to act on the RCE papers filed in this application on December 7, 2005 by February 7, 2006. Accordingly, approval of the entry of Supplemental Amendment is further requested at least because it is being filed over two weeks before the Examiner’s indicated date of February 7, 2006.

CONCLUSIONS

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below if any outstanding issues still need to be resolved. If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Supplemental Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0573.


If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: January 20, 2006

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465